

Application No. 10/766,765

RBUS 1310-1

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed 17 October 2005, the Examiner objected to page 1 of 4 of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted with the application because one of the references cited therein was a duplicate. The Examiner reviewed claims 1-44. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b); has allowed claims 18-44, and has objected to claims 2-17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 12-14, 31, 33 and 36, and canceled claim 3. Claims 1-2 and 4-41 are now pending.

Objection to the Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has objected to page 1 of 4 of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted with the application because it contains a reference already cited.

Applicant resubmits herewith page 1 of 4 of the SB/08 with the duplicative reference crossed out. It is requested that the Examiner initial the remaining references.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection to the Information Disclosure Statement as amended is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Olafsson (US Pat. 6,163,570). Applicant has amended claim 1, without prejudice to any continuing applications, to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3. The Examiner indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if presented in independent form.

Applicant has also amended claim 1 to address ambiguity concerning the term "operation value" for the first and second parameters.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 as amended is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has allowed claims 18-44. Applicant has amended independent claim 31 claims 33, which depends on claim 31, to ambiguity concerning the term "operation value" for

Application No. 10/766,765

RBUS 1310-1

the first and second parameters. Claim 36 is amended to correct a typographic error. Otherwise, such claims are not amended.

Objection to Claims 2-17

The Examiner has objected to claims 2-17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has incorporated the subject matter of claim 3 into claim 1, cancelled claim 3, and amended claims 13 and 14 to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection to claims 2 and 4-17 as amended is respectfully requested.

An additional Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith, accompanied by the IDS fee of \$180.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee determined to be due in connection with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0869 (RBUS 1310-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

17 Jan 06

Mark A. Haynes, Reg. No. 30,846

RAMBUS
c/o HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 712-0340 phone
(650) 712-0263 fax